

UNITED STATES SPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings

Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 SERIAL NUMBER FIRST NAMED INVENTOR FILING DATE ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 08/009,982 01/27/93 SOKOLOV Ū **EXAMINER** 25M1/0104 ILYA ZBOROVSKY ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 6 SCHOOLHOUSE WAY DIX HILLS, NY 11746 5 2506 DATE MAILED: 01/04/94 This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application. COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS ☐ This application has been examined A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire. month(s). Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133 THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(8) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION: Part I 2. D Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948. ☐ Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. ☐ Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. 6. 🗆 _ SUMMARY OF ACTION 1. 🛛 Claims _____1 -1 🖇 ____ are pending in the application. Of the above, claims are withdrawn from consideration. 2. 🗵 Claims 10, 11 3. Claims 4. 🗹 Claims 1-9, 12-18 are rejected. 5. Claims ____ _ are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement. 7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1:85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.

EXAMINER'S ACTION

14. Other

8. \Box Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

examiner. disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

been filed in parent application, serial no.

are acceptable. not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948).

10. \square The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on ______ has (have) been \square approved by the

11.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on _______, has been approved. disapproved (see explanation).

13. \Box Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in

12. \square Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has \square been received \square not been received

___ ; filed on _

Serial No. 009,982 Art Unit 2506

The fax amendment of December 22, 1993 fails to number the new claims consecutively as prescribed by 37 CFR 1.126, and these claims have been renumbered 15-18.

Claims 1-9 and 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The limiting meaning of "main grid portion" in claims 1 and 14-16 is unclear as no structure has been defined. The meanings of "lining" in claims 2, 3, 7, 13 and 17 and of "both end sides" in claim 18 are unclear. There are no antecedent bases for "said covers" in claims 5 and 6 and for "said lining" in claim 13. Claims 14 and 18 are incomplete for failing to recite essential elements of the invention such as grid moving means.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to provide support for the invention as it is now claimed. There is no teaching in the original disclosure that the cells have sides arranged relative to the side of the main

Serial No.
Art Unit

009,982 2506

portion at "an angle different from 0°, 45° and 90°" as in claim 15.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth in the objection to the specification.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 and 8, 9 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Caldwell. See lines 27-35 of page 2 and 103-108 of page 3.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 4-7, 12, 13, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

Serial No. 009,982 Art Unit 2506

§ 103 as being unpatentable over Caldwell. Caldwell does not show top and bottom covers on his grid, but it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide same in order to protect the delicate partitions from damage. It would further have been obvious to vaccuate the Caldwell cells in order to minimize x-ray absorption.

Applicant's arguments filed October 29 and December 22, 1993 have been fully considered, but they are not deemed to be persuasive. What applicant's disclosure and claims refer to as a lining actually appears to be a frame, and applicant's terminology, therefor, seems to be misdescriptive. The Caldwell grid partitions are angled so as to erase images of the grid partitions during x-ray exposure (lines 27-35 of page 2), and applicant has no support for claiming other than that the sides of the cells are not parallel to the direction of movement.

Although applicant asserts that Caldwell does not teach a flat grid lines 103-108 of page 3 of the patent reveal otherwise.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Serial No. Art Unit

009,982 2506 -5-

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Church at telephone number (703) 308-4861.

Craig & Church

CRAIG E. CHURCH
Senior Examiner
ART UNIT 2506